

CANDOUR *The British Views - Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol 38, No 5.

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

May, 1987.

CONDIGN PUNISHMENT - AND CHEAP AT THE PRICE!

by NOEL HUNT

THE periodical Parliamentary debates on the reintroduction of capital and corporal punishment are occasions of deep satisfaction to the right thinker and the man of good will.

For one thing, he has the exquisite pleasure of denying to the English people that he is well aware what most of them want, viz. the return to the Statute Book of hanging and the birch. It is noticeable that though the word "democracy" is seldom off their lips, such people have no hesitation at all in turning into thorough oligarchs when it's a question of doing what is right. There is also the deep satisfaction to be gained by showing the public yet again their exquisitely tender susceptibilities and deep love of "mankind" - feelings which have done so much in our time to destroy the fabric of our society. The man of good will contemplates with sober satisfaction the vast number of public platforms on which he can take his place and thence emit dense clouds of pious cant and sanctimonious hypocrisy. Only a seminar on South Africa and the evils of apartheid can provide as many opportunities for high-minded drivel as a debate on hanging.

Stone Dead Hath No Fellow

Naturally, it is regrettable that in spite of constant admonitions from talking heads, "opinion formers" and "experts", the mass of the English public remains stubbornly convinced that when it comes to murder and violent crime, stone dead hath no fellow.

Members of Parliament, ever prating of "democracy", will deny that they are in the House to represent the views of their electorates. Rather, they say they will do what they, in their wisdom, see as best for those who put them there. They take this line secure in the knowledge that the public memory is so short that when they next come to solicit votes, their stance on capital punishment will have been forgotten. M.P.s also happily bear in mind the fact that even if the House voted unanimously for the death penalty, it would achieve nothing. Even in such an unlikely event, the views of the liberal minority would still prevail. It would simply be pointed out that the death penalty has already been outlawed by the European Court, like so much else that makes for national discipline and stability. Thus, it would be "illegal" for our Parliament to dare to produce legislation to bring back either the rope or the lash.

All men of good will hope that it will never be necessary to be so painfully explicit. From the liberal point of view, there are already far too many people in Britain who still think the affairs of Englishmen should be conducted with the interests of England in mind and without regard to the views of a group of left-wing Europeans. Such coarse and blinkered chauvinists are all too prone to argue that if the European Court forbids capital punishment, then we should get out of Europe as soon as possible. Far better not to bring such a prevalent view into the open, because if the powers of the European Court and the Council of

Ministers were freely discussed the tiresome chauvinists might raise a cry of "Treason!". They are quite capable, too, of pointing out that not one decision of the European Court has strengthened society or left it more capable of defending itself against its many enemies.

It has been suggested that what is required is a referendum on the re-introduction of the death penalty, but there is no hope whatever of any government of whatever party agreeing to such a proposal. Plainly, what is needed is a new approach to the questions of capital and corporal punishment - one that cuts out the cant and the hypocrisy and removes the debate from the sphere of morals. This could best be done by arguing not that such punishments are morally right but simply that they are cheaper!

Hang The Fellow And Hang The Cost!

If this were the criterion used, i.e. that the view of the taxpayer should prevail over that of the man of goodwill, then an entirely new field is opened up. For one thing, only those in employment and paying taxes would be entitled to be heard on the subject. The taxpayers' spokesman would not attempt to argue rights or wrongs. Nor would he deny that no matter what care is taken errors are inevitable: only liberals are always right, so the spokesman would stress that any human system is imperfect and always will be. Thus there must be occasional errors. This is regrettable, but at least the cheapest option has been chosen. It is deplorable that a man should be hanged or flogged for a crime he did not commit. Yet it is equally deplorable that he should be imprisoned for years for a crime he did not commit. Imprisonment is horribly costly; in addition, there is the burden of State payments to support the criminal's wife and family. Then, too, there are the expensive services of the many professional "carers" who will become involved in "understanding" and "supportive" roles designed to help his family. It is considerably cheaper to hang the fellow.

Once the question is removed from the moral field, and once the dense fog of hypocrisy and cant has evaporated, we should be able to hear the indignant voice of the hitherto ignored taxpayer for a change. This forgotten man can point out that criminals are expensive nuisances, and that the expense and the nuisance fall on the blameless taxpayer. Hanging murderers and rapists would save millions every year. A short term of rigorous imprisonment, including solitary confinement and sparse diet and a sound thrashing where appropriate, would mean that thugs, muggers and the like would serve shorter terms. Once again, there would be huge savings to the taxpayer.

The liberals will argue that this attempts to put a cash value on a human being. They will hold that not only is this an intolerable affront to "mankind", but that it is impossible. Such a contention, like so much liberal rhetoric, is nonsense. No slave trader ever found it impossible to set a price on his wares. Nor did the buyer find it hard to value the merchandise. For that matter, a visit to the nearest benefits office will swiftly show the enquirer exactly how much he is worth a week. So why should not the power of the purse supplant the lump in the throat which has hitherto dominated discussion on the question of the death penalty?

Our present system treats violent criminals as misguided individuals who require understanding and help, never punishment. This is enormously expensive. Let us, just for once, listen to the taxpayer. We might not only save millions, but also make it possible to walk our streets in safety once more without fear of murder or attack.

FROM SMOTHER TO SMOKESCREEN

by GEOFFREY FLEETWOOD

THE AIDS phenomenon has placed the Liberalist Establishment in a difficult position. If the disease afflicted members of unideologically-sound groups, for example married men, it would be permissible, indeed mandatory, to tell the truth about its origins and spread. However, the disease afflicts, is spread by, and on the face of it originated in the actions of an ideologically recognised and subsidised group - the sodomites. Far from the truth being told about the disease, it is therefore necessary that it be hidden, not only from the public - something par for the course - but from the full cognizance of the Liberalist Establishment itself. This would not be a matter for horrendous consequence if it were certain that the disease could only afflict and be spread among sodomites, since it would then be a self-inflicted injury with a self-evident remedial regime. The fact that it is certain that the disease can be spread by blood transfusion and by human intercourse cannot be hidden, at least any longer, though infection by medical blood transfusion was denied with tragic consequences to over 1000 innocent people until exposed by **The Mail on Sunday**. What is being smothered by silence is the disease's origin and what is being hidden by a smokescreen is the potential of the virus to adapt to new means of transmission.

Malignant Mutation

Consider the origin of the disease. It is caused by a virus (HIV), a single living molecule capable of penetrating a living cell and then changing the environment of the cell from hostile to supportive. Viruses mutate rapidly, perhaps every three or four years. It is for this reason that it is impossible to discover a cure for the common cold - the virus has mutated before any "magic bullets" comparable to the sulphonamide drugs and anti-biotics in their action against bacterial disease, can be made widely available. It is possible that the mutation which has produced HIV has occurred before in human history. If this were the case, its failure to propagate can only be because the human environment of the virus did not facilitate its propagation. The conclusion is inescapable: the widespread practice of sodomy, facilitated and encouraged by the legislation of the Liberalist Establishment provided a supportive environment when the mutation occurred.

The virus can be transmitted by blood, not only by clinical transfusion but by a scratch. A correspondent in **The Guardian** relates that his brother contracted the disease, and has since died, whilst cleaning a toilet: several hypodermic needles disposed there stuck in his hand. In spite of fervent denials it is difficult to believe that the virus cannot be transmitted by the bite of blood-sucking insects: the flea, the mosquito and the tse-tse fly. One reason there is no "evidence" for this is that none has been looked for yet. Another might be that the virus has not yet infected the insect population. It is utterly reckless to suppose that either it cannot, or that some future mutation will not, enable it to do so.

The full horror of the situation, however, is not exhausted. If the virus can be transmitted, or adapts itself to transmission, by blood-sucking insects, it can infect the world's cattle and hence meat and dairy products. All life is tenacious and expansive, perhaps none more so than virus life, and sooner or later a mutation will occur which is adapted to transmission in this way. It may be argued that no published research

indicates any such possibility and that we are indulging in alarmist rumours. In fact, there is no published research which supports the view being pedalled by the Establishment that the virus can be spread by human intercourse equally as by sodomy. What has been demonstrated is that cell-free and budding virusi have been found in saliva specimens, hence the warning about sharing tooth-brushes. A research paper has been published on the infection of a woman by her husband who was infected by contaminated blood products whilst undergoing an operation which left him impotent. Similarly, only five per cent of the wives or husbands of people infected by blood transfusions have become AIDS positive.

This being the case, it is again reckless for the Establishment to give the impression that promiscuity can be rendered "safe" by the use of condoms. It would be pertinent to ask these enthusiastic propagandists where the condom should be worn - on the tongue presumably! The motives behind the insistent propaganda for "protected" sex, however, now becomes apparent. If normal people contract the disease, it is not the originators who are to be blamed but the victims themselves for not using "protection".

A Case For Euthanasia?

An example of the Liberalist disease is afforded by the Pinteresque silence of their Euthanasia Brigade. It seems odd that those whose distorted sense of compassion urges the doing to death of handicapped infants, the hopelessly deformed and the incurably ill, have not come forward to urge the putting down of AIDS sufferers to save them several months of ignominious dying - not to mention eliminating a source of infection and a saving of public funds to boot!

That it is criminally reckless to smother the facts and confuse the issues with a flood of blather is indisputable, but what is the purpose? One suggestion is that the Establishment fears public fury against homosexuals. Given the overt and aggressive behaviour of some of these people, their demands for the "right" to proselytise and their emergence as a persecuting minority, such an outbreak would not be unlikely once people were in possession of unconfounded facts. By now no one should be surprised that an Establishment which has shewn disdain for the suffering of families trapped by poverty in the inner cities or of the aged in the face of lawless thuggery, should nevertheless be concerned for the safety of an ideologically recognised group which is largely of their creation. Given that, no one should be surprised that the Establishment is prepared to take any risk rather than admit its culpability.

A digression is necessary here. Homosexuality is an affliction, and one so great that it should command compassion. Nevertheless, it is an affliction. It is no more "natural" than having one leg or a hideous disfigurement. The cause of the affliction has been disputed. In the past, homosexuals tended to claim that it was congenital or psychological. If either were true, it would of course make nonsense of the claimed "right" to proselytise or present homosexuality as an "alternative". If it is involuntary, then it is not an alternative and attempts to proselytise the normal are doomed to failure, and therefore a waste of everyone's time. The fact is that homosexuality is a psychosomatic disease, roughly comparable to drug addiction or alcoholism. We rightly have compassion on people afflicted with these diseases, but that compassion does not extend to permitting them to induct others into drug-addiction or alcoholism. What seems clear is that the majority of homosexuals are inducted into

their illness by vicious persons already afflicted, and that the repeal of laws against homosexual practice, without prohibition of proselytising or promiscuity, has caused a spread of the condition never before experienced. It seems a matter of commonsense that whilst both afflicted and self-afflicted persons should be helped to return to normality, the further spread of homosexuality should be prevented by all religious, educational, social and psychological means known to society.

Concern to prevent discrimination, even pogroms, against homosexuals, however, is not the main reason for the Establishment taking the stupendous risk they are taking. There is a deeper reason yet. AIDS is the Sword of Damocles hanging over the whole rotten Liberalist Establishment and the society it has created. Its philosophy and policy are now discredited, not just in debate, not simply in theory, but in praxis. The public reaction it rightly fears would bring it down in ruins. AIDS is the Scourge of God placed in the hands of the traditional elements of society, inaccurately termed the "Right" and perhaps better termed the "Legitimists" ["Right" as opposed to "Wrong" is better still! - Editor]. Given their past performance, they will no doubt let it slip through their nerveless fingers. Not so the Left. If the Liberalists are anxious to keep the question under wraps so as not to alert the "Right" to its opportunity, the Left can be relied upon to let the cat out of the bag. "AIDS CRISIS - NO RETURN TO VICTORIAN MORALITY" is the battle-cry of the Socialist Workers Party and it is easy to understand why. The Left have used sex as the solvent of society and now suddenly it is neutralised. (Perhaps that is a motive for the reckless "safe sex" campaign?) Perhaps it is time for the Legitimists to formulate their policy?

With acknowledgement to Liverpool Newsletter, 17 Hadassah Grove, Lark Lane, Liverpool L17 8XH. Subscription rate: £2 per annum.

THE COMMON MARKET'S TROJAN HORSE

THE full significance of the passing of the Single European Act is in reality of overwhelming importance, but played down by the media to something unworthy of discussion. With tension rising in preparation for the coming Election, each party is scratching round for electorally live material, yet this, the most important of all, is left untouched. Can it be that while attention has been attracted to trivial matters, a Trojan Horse has been wheeled in?

The Anti-Common Market League has published a booklet entitled **Bound To Fail** which indicates that this old manoeuvre is still practised. We have heard repeatedly that the question of sovereignty for the Falkland Islanders is not negotiable. Meanwhile, our own sovereignty is discarded without the public's knowledge and despite assurances at the time of the referendum that our national independence would not be endangered. It is impossible to conceive that our independence would have been surrendered to any other power in return for a bribe of alleged benefit, but through stealth that action has been taken. All who wish to study the full facts from a legal authority of how this was achieved will find them provided in a chapter by Leolin Price, Q.C. Various other writers deal with the political, social and economic consequences of E.E.C. membership. This booklet should be read by all who love our country.

Bound To Fail is obtainable from the Anti-Common Market League, 52 Fulham High Street, London SWQ6 3LQ, for £2.

A.M. WADE

TO WHOM WILL THE WORLD BELONG IN THE YEAR 2000?

by ABBE GEORGES DE NANTES

REFLECTING on what the Christian faith in the year 2000 may be like, I wanted to meet a futurologist from among my friends. The name of futurologist, a misplaced neologism going with astrologer, is quite unsuitable for him. His vast and sure information, his loftiness of vision make him what I would more soberly call a predictor. He sees events coming and he is able to map their outlines before they happen, leaving the whole field open, however, to chance and Providence.

Russians In The East, Jews In The West

- What will the world be like, what religion will dominate?
- One would first need to know what Moscow will do. They will doubtless have conquered northern Europe, Scandinavia and in Germany everything north of the Main and the Rhine. They will be able to breathe the ocean air! The Russians are always suffocated at home. Their plans have been ready for 20 years, constantly being revised. NATO will be taken by surprise through waiting and no longer expecting. The Soviet thrust in the Southern hemisphere will continue without meeting any serious obstacle: the Philippines, New Caledonia, finally Chile for Cape Horn. It is a two-fold obsession: to close the world's great sea routes to others and to keep them for oneself. There is also the dream of the poles: they are fascinated by Antarctica. Another fruit which will fall to them before long is Southern Africa. As for the rest of the third world, Moscow will be content to keep them in a state of war, famine and revolution. Russian imperialism prefers subversion to war.
- And elsewhere, what religious developments are foreseeable?
- Obviously, in the years to come Judaism will move to first place. Its ascent is more than spectacular: it is dogmatic, it is organised, it is militant. The religious Jews have faith in themselves together with.... [the rest of this response has been deleted by our own self-imposed censorship under the "Conservative" Government's new Public Order Act as it would run us the risk of prosecution - Editor].
- And Islam?
- Again, everything depends on Moscow. It will count on Arab terrorism as a fixed constant in its politics for a long time as yet. It is very clever. It is a two-part subversion, pursued in accordance with two different sets of logic, holding its disconcerted adversary in pincers: on the one side Islam, then further on the Communist Party.

The Suicide Of The Roman Church

- But what about Christianity, the Church in the year 2000?
- Disappeared, dead, committed suicide. Forgive my bluntness, but this is no time for illusions. Your popes have self-destroyed the Church in great solemnity, having summoned the world to witness this amazing spectacle. They have programmed it themselves, with last will and testament, family reunion, chanting of the nunc dimittis.
- Could you be less enigmatic?
- On 4th October 1965, Paul VI went to Manhattan to apprise the assembly of the world's nations that the Catholic Church no longer had sufficient strength and secular hold to make peace reign in the world. That she was, therefore, abdicating in favour of UNO. The Pope laid down his temporal mission and prostrated himself before this huge American, judaeo-masonic, plutocratic organisation. Manhattan thereby became the centre of the political world, and Rome fell to the rank of a third world small town. On 27th October last, John-Paul II consummated the auto da

fe so brilliantly inaugurated by his spiritual master by gathering together all the world's religions, under the direction of a mysterious power, to confess to them that the God of all the Christians could not even guarantee the religious hope of the world. Now even religion would cease to spring from Rome. All the religions represented there were made to look strangely ridiculous. Except that of those who convened the gathering. The impact of Assisi is the self-denial of the Catholic Church and its intentional lowering to the rank of all the dead religions on their way out of the world. It is the announcement of the World's future religion: that of those who organised and paid for it all.

- But who then?

- The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. It is spelt out plainly in the Osservatore Romano. They are the ones who opened the way to Assisi. It is they who prepared the unleavened bread mysteriously brought from Paris for the strange communal eucharist. Thus the Church extends her hand to international judaeo-masonry, the mass media commanded to witness the event. What is this if not suicide? Hundreds of millions saw the Pope invite the comedy Amerindians to smoke the peace pipe and shout "Manitou! Manitou!" in order to obtain from the "Great Spirit" of the Redskins the peace which the Vicar of Jesus Christ is no longer able to procure with his own rites. There was no Mass at Assisi that day. Did the Pope say his Mass secretly? The Osservatore Romano, which observes all, failed to see it if he did. There was no cross either, not even on John-Paul II's breast, unless it were well hidden beneath his white overcoat to avoid embarrassment. There was no statue of Our Lady, not a single Ave Maria. Nothing of what has been known for centuries as capable of touching Heaven. Instead, there was a free display of all that leaves Heaven indifferent, or which, by its very presence, may provoke the Anger of the Most High.

- Monsieur l'Abbe, let's be serious. Assisi does not prove that the faith is lost, but that the faith has been dead for some time. The finishing blow was given by Paul VI in 1965, or by John XXIII in 1962. The broken soul of the Church spilt all its spiritual substance and now the plant has ceased to live....

All Despair Is Absolute Folly

I was stunned by the blow. Bolshevik invasion, judaeo-masonic domination, generalised Islamic terrorism, a treacherous and disintegrated Church. Is that then the summary of the thirteen chapters of the prelude to the year 2000? Faced with such a serious, impartial and scientific prediction, who would not be shaken? And yet, ours is a different temperament. Perhaps we shall have the Russians, as we had the Germans. But, we shall get out of it!

I am a Christian. But as the word "Christian" has long since lost all meaning, and even worse after Assisi, I shall be more explicit. A disciple of Montini, Christ on earth come down at Manhattan? No! A disciple of Karol Wojtyla, one of the twelve gurus imploring the great Manitou together with the Dalai Lama? No! What then?

I am "Fatamist", meaning a member of those "communities on the fringes of the Church who enthuse over the predictions, true or false, of Fatima". The title is perfect: "Fatamist". Therefore I believe in the prophecies of Our Lady of Fatima more than, and even in opposition to, the future already programmed by our predictor.

Read **The Abbe de Nantes: Fidei Defensor**, by Fr. Brocard Sewell, in the Spring 1987 issue of **Lodestar**. £1.20, including postage, from Sanctuary Press Ltd., Nash House, Fishponds Road, London SW17.

IN THE TRADITION OF KEIR HARDIE?

"...Critics commented on the high proportion of Jewish businessmen, particularly foreign-born entrepreneurs, who had bank-rolled Wilson in the days of Opposition and were increasingly popping up in his honours lists ...From the days, 30 years ago, when he was economic adviser to the timber firm of Montague L. Meyer, Wilson had enjoyed constructing East-West deals and mixing with high-flying entrepreneurs. Rudy Sternberg, who made millions out of trade with East Germany, was a man he much admired.

"Others in the circle included Sir George (now Lord) Weidenfeld, the eminent publisher; Sir Samuel Fisher, vice-president of the London diamond bourse; Arie Handler, London managing director of the International Credit Bank of Geneva, a back-up organisation for a group of Israeli financiers; Sigmund Sternberg, a Hungarian emigre who made a fortune in scrap metal; Harry (later Lord) Kissin, a Russian-Jewish lawyer who specialised in commodity trading; and Frank Schon, an Austrian-Jewish businessman who also became a life peer...

"The Israeli Embassy was reportedly delighted at the wave of pro-Zionism which emanated from No. 10 in those days. Senior civil servants took to calling the Wilson-Marcia connections the 'Bar-Mitzvah Circuit' and the links caused considerable unease among Left-wing Palestinian circles of the Labour Party."

- Sunday Telegraph, May 3rd., 1987.

"The main mark of modern governments is that we do not know who governs, de facto any more than de jure. We see the politician and not his backer; still less the backer of the backer; or, what is most important of all, the banker of the backer. Throned above all, in a manner without parallel in all the past, is the veiled prophet of finance, swaying all men living by a sort of magic."

- G.K. Chesterton.

LAST GASP TRAGEDY OF ELIZA AGED 92

A frail old woman who smoked 15 cigarettes a day for 78 years died trying to light one of her favourite Woodbines, a coroner's court in Walthamstow was told last month. Eliza Farrendon, aged 92, loved smoking, starting at the age of 14, and throughout her long life, consumed almost half a million cigarettes. "It was one of the pleasures in her life," said Coroner Sir Montague Levine. But that pleasure cost Eliza her life. While trying to light up on January 15, she dropped the match down the side of her chair. "Beware of smoking," the ASHen-faced opponents of tobacco doubtless cried. Actually, what the report states is that after smoking about 500,000 cigarettes and surviving, the old lady was killed by the one she didn't smoke!

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £5.00 OVERSEAS £6.00 AIRMAIL U.S. \$10 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

Candour needs more subscribers! Have YOU secured one yet?

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD, England (Editor: Rosine de Bounevialle).

D E F E N C E - A K E Y I S S U E

BUT WHAT ARE WE DEFENDING ?

This may seem an unnecessary question, but it is a vital one if we are to arrive at a correct answer. **What exactly are our armed forces supposed to be defending?** Many people might loosely reply "Britain" and leave it at that. Alright. Try another angle. **What exactly would an enemy-attack upon Britain be attacking?** ANSWER: The territorial and political SOVEREIGNTY of the British people. This loss of self-determination means the governing of Britain by an alien dictatorship.

So far we have studiously avoided indicating who might want to take away our sovereignty, as it clouds the essential issue. The other possibility is an attack, in combination with outside forces, by a fifth column within.

Armed forces are tools for the pursuit of policy when diplomatic means fail. War is the ultimate sanction for policy of a nation state. Such a policy may be offensive for enlarging the territory of that state, or defensive for maintaining the sovereignty of that state. One wouldn't normally expect to maintain an army in order to reduce sovereignty, would one?

WHAT ARE THE POLITICAL PARTY POLICIES ON BRITISH SOVEREIGNTY?

	<u>Retain</u>	<u>Surrender to</u>
CONSERVATIVE	NO	United States of Europe, NATO, UNO
LABOUR	NO	United States of Europe, NATO, UNO
ALLIANCE	NO	United States of Europe, NATO, UNO
BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY	YES	LEAVE EEC, NATO AND UNO
NATIONAL FRONT	YES	LEAVE EEC, NATO AND UNO
GREEN PARTY	NO	Dissolve world into regional alliances

Having established to some extent their political position regarding that which would be removed by an enemy attack, viz. sovereignty, let us examine further this political "back up" to the military posture.

While LABOUR'S long-standing enthusiasm for the Russian "experiment" is well-known (if now less enthusiastic in some quarters), it is a fact well-concealed from the general public in Britain that ALL the main parties, whether in government or not, have supported or implemented the programme of the COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL of 1928 and 1936 since the end of World War II, both inside and outside Britain. This programme has three stages:

- * Introduce SOCIALISM into the nations of the world, either by force or parliamentary means (in Britain by all-party agreement of the wartime coalition). IMPLEMENTED BY LABOUR.
- * Merge the socialised nations into LARGE BLOCS, e.g. the EEC (in Britain in 1973 by all-party agreement). IMPLEMENTED BY CONSERVATIVES.
- * Merge the socialised blocs into a WORLD UNION of soviet socialist republics, i.e. do away with all monarchies. TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY WHICHEVER PARTY IS IN GOVERNMENT.

We are well into stage 2 and part into stage 3. In the light of this . . .

WHAT ARE THE POLITICAL PARTY POLICIES ON DEFENCE?

The policies of the three main parties are based, with variations, on an "anti-communist" posture, as well as a couple of false premises, viz.

- 1) "America" is our ally.
- 2) NATO is essential for Britain's defence.

	<u>CONS.</u>	<u>LAB.</u>	<u>ALL.</u>	<u>B.N.P.</u>	<u>N.F.</u>	<u>GREEN</u>
America a staunch ally	Yes	No?	Yes	NO	NO	No
NATO essential to Britain	Yes	Yes	Yes	NO	NO	No
Keep nuclear weapons	Yes	No	Yes?	YES	YES	No
Keep US bases in Britain	Yes	No	Yes	NO	NO	No

"AMERICA" - OUR ALLY?

History has proved that "American" governments are hostile to British interests. In 1943 General Marshall went to the Quebec Conference briefed to the effect that the greatest obstacle to post-war dollar expansion was the BRITISH EMPIRE. We were required to liquidate it to pay for the war-time "Lend-Lease", while at every stage of withdrawal "American" influence was at work sabotaging our position.

"AMERICA" - IS IT REALLY ANTI-COMMUNIST?

Ask the average American and he would say he is against the Soviet type of government. But, as Churchill so aptly pointed out, "Communism" first gained a hold in Russia and then advanced across half of Europe entirely because of "American" involvement in both world wars. Moreover, ever since the Russian Revolution of 1917 powerful sections of "American" and other western financial and industrial organisations have been building Russia into the huge war-machine it is today, for profit and ideological reasons. In the early 1970s "American" financial institutions cancelled the Russian war-debt and granted "favoured trading nation" status (while making us pay for ours, remember!). All in the line of business, don't you know?

NATO - ESSENTIAL FOR BRITAIN'S DEFENCE?

Indeed, not! Provided you don't take it at face value, it is deadly and dangerous.

- * In the event of an attack from the Soviet bloc, a large proportion of Britain's troops would leave this island and go to Europe (shades of Dunkirk?).
- * NATO membership involves loss of national defence sovereignty (i.e. using our forces first and foremost for the defence of this nation). This "sharing of sovereignty" means the scrambling of defence equipment manufacture with other nations and the loss of our ability to manufacture independently in the event of Europe being overrun in a Soviet attack.
- * Further loss of sovereignty results from these forces being under American command.
- * It is claimed NATO has kept the peace for 40 years. Much more likely is that Western collaboration with the Communist plan has avoided war!

ANSWERING THE RIDDLE - THE REAL "ENEMY WITHIN"

How can the British political establishment be playing this double game? Simply, by promoting the myth that "COMMUNISM" is opposed to CAPITALISM, instead of the truth that "COMMUNISM" (as in Russia) is really CAPITALISM without "human rights". Capitalism promotes Communist revolution, as in Russia in 1917 and China in 1949. There is no Communist movement that has not operated in the interests of Money - without the idealists among its leaders having the slightest suspicion of the fact. We could just as easily say that the programme of the COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL and the CAPITALIST INTERNATIONAL are the same!

Since we are clearly into stage 3 of the plan (see Command 5924, 1975, as an indicator), it's not hard to imagine why British Prime Ministers travel periodically to Washington and Moscow. Some party leaders keep up an "anti-communist" pretence for the benefit of their supporters who aren't "in the know" about the Washington-London-Moscow axis. One must ask: "Which way is this merger going? Is East becoming more like West, or vice versa?" The EEC is not a "bulwark against Communism" at all. It is destined to be a "European Communist Market". We shall have an alien government without a shot being fired!

Please use this leaflet to make Defence and Sovereignty prominent issues in the run-up to the next General Election by challenging main party candidates in meetings, 'phone-ins, letters to the press and on the door-step.

For a literature pack containing further information on the menace to national sovereignty, send £3 to UKIS, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.

Printed and published by UK Information Service, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.